



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,474	03/19/2001	Lenka M. Jelinek	5038-66	1631

7590 04/21/2006

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 S.W. Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205

EXAMINER

BHATTACHARYA, SAM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/812,474	Applicant(s) JELINEK, LENKA M.	
	Examiner Sam Bhattacharya	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-11,13-19,22,23,25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-11,13-19,22,23,25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1, 2, and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, Jr. (U.S. 6,023,610) in view of D'Hont (US 5,491,483).

As to claim 1, Figure 1 in Wood, Jr. shows a set (10) comprising:

an RF transponder (16) to use with a toy ("the radio frequency data communications device 12 includes a transponder 16 having a receiver 30 and a transmitter 32." (Col. 3, lines 62-64). "The radio frequency data communication device 12 can be included in any appropriate housing or package" (Col. 4, lines 17-18). "There is a need for tag devices suitably configured to mount to a variety of objects including goods, items, persons, or animals, or substantially any moving or stationary and animate or inanimate object" (Col. 2, lines 6-9));

at least two antennas (X1, X2) to emit detection signals to the RF transponder ("the interrogator (26) communicates with the transponder 16 via the RF antennas X1, X2, ... , R1, R2 ... , etc." (Col. 10, lines 21-23)); and

a multiplexer (78, Figure 7) coupled to the two antennas to activate a first one of the antennas at a different time interval than a second one of the antennas ("the RF circuitry 54 further includes a diversity switch 78, coupled to the power amplifier 76, for transmission of the

Art Unit: 2617

amplified signal through a selected one of the two transmit antennas X1 and X2” (Col. 13, lines 29-32). “When the interrogator attempts communication with a transponder 16, the interrogator will first attempt communications using the data at the top of the queue 90; i.e., in the embodiment shown in FIG. 8, the interrogator will first attempt to use an antenna pair represented by data in the first or top row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X1 and receive antenna R1 in the illustrated embodiment). If successful communication is not established, the interrogator 26 will attempt communication using the antenna pair represented by data in the second row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X1 and receive antenna R2). If successful communication is still not established, the interrogator 26 will attempt communication using the antenna pair represented by data in the third row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X2 and receive antenna R1)” (Col. 14, lines 36-51). “Each attempt takes time. For example, in one embodiment, each attempt takes 20-40 milliseconds. Thus, in the illustrated embodiment, attempt 1 and attempt 2 fail, so 40-80 milliseconds are lost” (Col. 15, lines 4-7)).

The Wood, Jr. reference does not expressly disclose the antennas are coil antennas, wherein the coil antennas have single turn coils. However, in an analogous art, the D’Hont reference teaches the antennas are coil antennas 14, wherein the coil antennas have single turn coils. See FIG. 4 and col. 6, lines 5-15.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the set of Wood, Jr. wherein the antennas are coil antennas, and the coil antennas have single turn coils, as taught by Dowdle, in order to have easy detection of an accessed object and to use an antenna that is easier to install.

As to claim 2, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the set of claim 1, wherein the multiplexer is to activate periodically the first and the second antennas (see Col. 14, lines 36-51 and Col. 15, lines 4-7).

As to claim 5, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the set of claim 1, wherein each of the antennas has a main axis, and the antennas are oriented such that their respective main axes are not parallel to each other (“in one embodiment, the transmit antenna X2 is oriented at an angle different from the angle of the transmit antenna X1” (Col. 14, lines 27-29)).

As to claim 6, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the set of claim 1, wherein each of the antennas has a main axis, and the antennas are oriented such that their respective main axes are substantially parallel to each other (“in a more particular embodiment, the transmit antenna X1 is spaced apart from the transmit antenna X2 by a distance of between one wavelength and ten wavelengths” (Col. 14, lines 19-22). See also Figure 1).

As to claim 7, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the set of claim 1, wherein each of the antennas has a main plane, and the antennas are oriented such that their respective main planes are substantially parallel to each other, but they do not belong in the same plane (“in a more particular embodiment, the transmit antenna X1 is spaced apart from the transmit antenna X2 by a distance of between one wavelength and ten wavelengths” (Col. 14, lines 19-22). See also Figure 1).

As to claim 8, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the set of claim 1, further comprising: a program adapted to determine which one of the two antennas receives a return signal from the RF transponder (“the host computer 48 includes an application program for controlling the interrogator 26 and interpreting responses, and a library of radio frequency identification device

Art Unit: 2617

applications or functions” (Col. 5, lines 27-30). “A GetCrntAntenna function returns the current antenna set used to communicate with a device 12” (Col. 17, lines 59-60). “FIG. 8 illustrates a stack or queue 90 including locations holding data representing antennas X1, X2, R1, and R2. The stack or queue 90 defines an order in which antennas will be used to attempt communication” (Col. 13, lines 62-65)).

4. Claims 9-11, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, Jr. (U.S. 6,023,610) in view of Hum et al. (US 2003/012265 A1), and further in view of Weston (US 2002/0193047 A1).

As to claims 9, 18 and 22, Figure 1 in Wood, Jr. shows a set (10) comprising:

a communications device (12) including an RF transponder (“the radio frequency data communications device 12 includes a transponder 16 having a receiver 30 and a transmitter 32.” (Col. 3, lines 62-64). “The radio frequency data communication device 12 can be included in any appropriate housing or package” (Col. 4, lines 17-18). “There is a need for tag devices suitably configured to mount to a variety of objects including goods, items, persons, or animals, or substantially any moving or stationary and animate or inanimate object” (Col. 2, lines 6-9));

at least two antennas (X1, X2) to emit respective first and second detection signals at different times from each other (“when the interrogator attempts communication with a transponder 16, the interrogator will first attempt communications using the data at the top of the queue 90; i.e., in the embodiment shown in FIG. 8, the interrogator will first attempt to use an antenna pair represented by data in the first or top row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X1 and receive antenna R1 in the illustrated embodiment). If successful communication

is not established, the interrogator 26 will attempt communication using the antenna pair represented by data in the second row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X1 and receive antenna R2). If successful communication is still not established, the interrogator 26 will attempt communication using the antenna pair represented by data in the third row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X2 and receive antenna R1)” (Col. 14, lines 36-51));

an antenna reader (26) to receive a return signal from the RF transponder responsive to one of the first and second detection signals (“the interrogator 26 transmits an interrogation signal or command 27 (“forward link”) via one of the antennas X1, X2, etc. The device 12 receives the incoming interrogation signal via its antenna 44. Upon receiving the signal 27, the device 12 responds by generating and transmitting a responsive signal or reply 29 (“return link”)” (Col. 5, lines 45-51)).

Wood, Jr. fails to disclose a program adapted to determine a location of the communications device on a play device. Hum et al. disclose a short-range communication system in which a position of a transponder, which can be attached to a toy, is communicated in response to an interrogation signal. (paragraph [0013], lines 17-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the set of Wood, Jr. by determining the location of a figurine on a device as taught by Hum et al. so that a user can decide to move the figurine to a more appropriate position if so desired.

The combination of Wood, Jr. and Hum fails to disclose that the communications device is a toy figurine. However, in an analogous art, Weston discloses a toy figurine 100 having an attached tag transponder 110 for communication of signals. See FIG. 1, paragraph 10, lines 1-6

Art Unit: 2617

and paragraph 28, lines 1-14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the set of Wood, Jr. and Hum et al. by incorporating the features taught in Weston so that the toy figurine, which are commonly misplaced, can be easily located and identified.

As to claim 10, the Wood, Jr. reference (Figure 7) discloses the set, further comprising:

an antenna driver (90) (“the stack or queue 90 defines an order in which antennas will be used to attempt communication” (Col. 13, lines 63-65)); and

a multiplexer (78) to receive a single antenna drive signal from the antenna driver, and to direct the antenna drive signal alternately between the first antenna and the second antenna to cause them to emit the first and second detection signals (“the RF circuitry 54 further includes a diversity switch 78, coupled to the power amplifier 76, for transmission of the amplified signal through a selected one of the two transmit antennas X1 and X2” (Col. 13, lines 29-32)).

As to claim 11, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the set of claim 9, further comprising: a program adapted to determine an identity of the toy figurine (“an Identify function is used when attempting to determine the identification of one or more of the devices 12. Each device 12 has its own identification number “TagId”. It is possible that the interrogator will receive a garbled reply if more than one tag responds with a reply. If replies from multiple tags are received, an arbitration scheme is used to isolate a single device 12” (Col. 16, lines 41-47)).

As to claims 19 and 25, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the article of claim 18 and the method of claim 22, comprising:

determining a response characteristic of the return signal; and matching the determined response characteristic with a response characteristic stored in a memory (“an Identify function

is used when attempting to determine the identification of one or more of the devices 12. Each device 12 has its own identification number "TagId". It is possible that the interrogator will receive a garbled reply if more than one tag responds with a reply. If replies from multiple tags are received, an arbitration scheme is used to isolate a single device 12" (Col. 16, lines 41-47). See also "Details of Arbitration" in Col. 18, line 21 to Col. 19, line 20).

As to claim 23, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the method of claim 22, further comprising:

receiving a single antenna drive signal; and multiplexing the antenna drive signal between the first antenna and the second antenna ("the stack or queue 90 defines an order in which antennas will be used to attempt communication" (Col. 13, lines 63-65). "The RF circuitry 54 further includes a diversity switch 78, coupled to the power amplifier 76, for transmission of the amplified signal through a selected one of the two transmit antennas X1 and X2" (Col. 13, lines 29-32). See also Figure 7).

As to claim 26, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the method of claim 22, wherein multiplexing the antenna drive signal is performed periodically (see Col. 14, lines 36-51 and Col. 15, lines 4-7).

5. Claims 13, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, Jr. (U.S. 6,023,610) in view of Denne et al. (US 4,691,202), and further in view of Weston (US 2002/0193047 A1).

As to claim 13, Figure 1 in Wood, Jr. shows a set for use with a program comprising:
a miniature device (20);

at least two antennas (X1, X2) to emit respective first and second detection signals at different time intervals, the antennas positioned at first and a second antenna locations of the miniature device respectively (“the RF circuitry 54 further includes a diversity switch 78, coupled to the power amplifier 76, for transmission of the amplified signal through a selected one of the two transmit antennas X1 and X2” (Col. 13, lines 29-32). “When the interrogator attempts communication with a transponder 16, the interrogator will first attempt communications using the data at the top of the queue 90; i.e., in the embodiment shown in FIG. 8, the interrogator will first attempt to use an antenna pair represented by data in the first or top row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X1 and receive antenna R1 in the illustrated embodiment). If successful communication is not established, the interrogator 26 will attempt communication using the antenna pair represented by data in the second row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X1 and receive antenna R2). If successful communication is still not established, the interrogator 26 will attempt communication using the antenna pair represented by data in the third row of the stack 90 (e.g., using transmit antenna X2 and receive antenna R1)” (Col. 14, lines 36-51));

a first communication device to place on the miniature device including a first RF transponder to generate a first return signal in response to the first detection signal; and a second communication device to place on the miniature device including a second RF transponder to generate a second return signal in response to the second detection signal (“in the embodiment illustrated in FIG. 1, multiple devices 12 can be employed; however, there is no communication between multiple devices 12. Instead, the multiple devices 12 communicate with the interrogator 26” (Col. 5, lines 62-65). “The radio frequency data communications device 12 includes a

Art Unit: 2617

transponder 16 having a receiver 30 and a transmitter 32.” (Col. 3, lines 62-64). “The radio frequency data communication device 12 can be included in any appropriate housing or package” (Col. 4, lines 17-18). “There is a need for tag devices suitably configured to mount to a variety of objects including goods, items, persons, or animals, or substantially any moving or stationary and animate or inanimate object” (Col. 2, lines 6-9));

Wood, Jr. fails to disclose identifying a first return signal with a first communication device and a second return signal with a second miniature device. Denne et al. disclose an identification system in which a plurality of transponders, which can be associated with different miniature devices, transmit respective identification signals in response to a signal from an interrogator. (col. 1, lines 50-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the set of Wood, Jr. by transmitting identification signals in a response from a transponder as taught by Denne et al. so that a user can determine whether each toy figurine is associated with the correct transponder.

The combination of Wood, Jr. and Denne et al. fails to disclose that the miniature devices are toy devices. However, in an analogous art, Weston discloses a toy figurine 100 having an attached tag transponder 110 for communication of signals. See FIG. 1, paragraph 10, lines 1-6 and paragraph 28, lines 1-14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the set of Wood, Jr. and Hum et al. by incorporating the features taught in Weston so that the toy figurine, which are commonly misplaced, can be easily located and identified.

As to claim 14, the Wood, Jr. reference (Figure 7) discloses the set, further comprising:

an antenna driver (90) (“the stack or queue 90 defines an order in which antennas will be used to attempt communication” (Col. 13, lines 63-65)); and

a multiplexer (78) to receive a single antenna drive signal from the antenna driver, and to direct the antenna drive signal alternatingly between the first antenna and the second antenna to cause them to emit the first and second detection signals (“the RF circuitry 54 further includes a diversity switch 78, coupled to the power amplifier 76, for transmission of the amplified signal through a selected one of the two transmit antennas X1 and X2” (Col. 13, lines 29-32)).

As to claim 17, the Wood, Jr. reference discloses the set of claim 9, wherein the RF transponder is detachably connected to the toy figurine (“the radio frequency data communications device 12 includes a transponder 16 having a receiver 30 and a transmitter 32.” (Col. 3, lines 62-64). “The radio frequency data communication device 12 can be included in any appropriate housing or package” (Col. 4, lines 17-18)).

6. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, Jr. (U.S. 6,023,610) in view of Denne et al. (US 4,691,202) and Hum et al. (US 2003/012265 A1), and further in view of Weston (US 2002/0193047 A1).

Claims 15 and 16 incorporate the limitations of claims 9 and 13, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as claims 9 and 13.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Bhattacharya whose telephone number is (571) 272-7917. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays, 9-6, with first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sb


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER